

## CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE MINUTES

---

### County Facilities

August 7, 2007 – 7:00 p.m.

Jury Assembly Room, Champaign County Courthouse - 101 E. Main, Urbana

MEMBERS PRESENT: Beckett, Bensyl, Betz, Cowart, James, Jay, Richards, Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sapp

OTHERS PRESENT: Denny Inman, Deb Busey, White & Borgognoni Architects,  
Scott Wachter, Susan McGrath, Barb Wysocki, Alan Reinhart,  
Bruce Hannon, Jim Page, Joan Dykstra, Media

### Call to Order

Chair Beckett called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call confirmed a quorum present.

### Approval of Agenda

MOTION by James to approve the agenda; seconded by Weibel. Motion carried.

### Approval of Minutes – June 12, 2007

MOTION by Betz to approve the minutes of June 12, 2007 as presented; seconded by Weibel. Motion carried.

### Public Participation

John Farney, an employee of the County Clerk's office spoke to the committee regarding the conditions in his office. He explained the temperature in his office today was over 80 degrees, employees have asked their supervisors to contact the proper people to have something done but they never receive a response. He also questioned why there is no hot water in the restrooms and asked to have someone look at a brown substance that is above each air conditioning vent in his office.

### Clock & Bell Tower

Presentation by Gail White – White & Borgognoni Architects

Mr. Beckett explained Gail White had presented to the Clock & Bell Tower Committee last month and they had recommended to the Facilities committee that option four be accepted as part of the overall exterior masonry project.

Gail White of White & Borgognoni Architects introduced his team members and brought the committee up to date regarding the work they have been doing. He explained they have been looking at existing conditions to find out what is causing the failure in the masonry and looking at options for reconstructing the clock & bell tower. They have looked at the original drawings and previous studies, talked with people who are knowledgeable about the building and repairs and maintenance. They have spent time going over every inch of the building façade to document deterioration and try to understand the causes and a lot of time doing preliminary design for the clock & bell tower. He explained one of the characteristics of this kind of sandstone is that it is very soft which was very popular because it was easy to carve which allowed the detail work that characterizes this building. One of the greatest concerns they saw with both the brick and the stone, when they removed some sections, was the metal ties which are in very poor condition. The terra cotta cornice is in very good condition and the main issues there have to do with cosmetics and not anything structural, but where the units have been joined with sealant they are recommending that be taken out. They ran cleaning tests to determine what is appropriate to use for repairs, with the clock & bell tower they saw many of the same situations in terms of stone work and trim and brick veneer and they have the same concerns as they do for the masonry.

As far as treatments for the masonry, there is a range of options for dealing with the deterioration. One is to take out the damaged pieces of stone and put a new piece back in. They have a couple of options for replacement materials because the original stone is not longer active. They looked at resurfacing the sandstone where it is scaling and they also considered taking the stones out turning them around and reinserting them, they ran some tests and that is not viable. They talked about taking the sandstone from the back and bringing it around to the front of the building, taking broken pieces out and using them in other locations. As a result, they are recommending using a combination of a number of those options, not one exclusively. For the lower portion of the building they will try and preserve the stone and slow down deterioration. The intricate carved stone they are recommending be replaced, the higher they get on the building they will look at using some pre-cast materials that will be longer in life and cost less.

He explained the intent of rebuilding the tower is to get it to its original height of 130 feet and there are nine options or recommended treatments; the first option includes the existing tower structure remaining and reconstructing the upper portion of the tower, the second option, option 1a, includes the existing structure remaining while removing veneer and repairing walls. Option 1b is basically the same as 1a but to remove some of the load from the existing masonry they will use a steel frame within the structure. The problem with options 1, 1a and 1b is they would be leaving a lot of the existing masonry there which is not good for the future and long term maintenance. Option #2 includes removing the existing tower above the attic, reconstructing the tower and constructing a steel frame, by reconstructing the tower above the attic the long term life would be greatly increased. Option #3 is removing the existing tower to the attic and north piers to the foundation and reconstructing the tower and piers. This is a viable option replacing all of the structure that has been exposed to moisture.

Option #4 is removing the entire existing tower including foundations and reconstruct the tower, similar to #3 yet not relying on existing structure.

Mr. James stated option #4 seems like the best and asked what Mr. White estimated the lifespan to be. Mr. White stated the lifespan is as long or longer than the remainder of the building. He also pointed out that with options 1 b and 2 columns are inset within the tower which would be in the office space below. Currently there are two columns below the attic level that go all the way to the foundation. Those columns plus additional ones would require reconfiguration of the office space to make is usable. He stated he understands this is a lot of information to digest, their anticipation was that this would pick up where previous consultants left off and they would just build on top of what is there. Building codes have changed and become much more strict, they started with a minimal approach and after looking at the designs determined that was not feasible, the last two options of tearing down the tower were never options they considered when they first came on but they felt, after giving it more consideration, there were merits to those options.

He explained that the cost information they based on the 2006 estimate from the previous consultant which at that time was a little over 2.5 million for the tower. The estimate in 2007 to stabilize and repair the existing tower without any extensions was almost \$900,000. Options 1 and 1a were not feasible so they didn't apply numbers to those. Option 1b work on existing tower is \$1,320,525.62 and the tower extension is \$1,364,361.72 with a total of \$2,684,887.34. Option 2 repairs to existing tower are \$1,551,015.17 and tower extension is \$1,335,929.72 with a total of \$2,886,944.89. Option 3 work on existing tower is \$1,690,940.10 and the tower extension is \$1,396,123.88 with a total of \$3,087,063.99. Option 4 work on the existing tower is \$1,931,740.61, and tower extension is \$1,393,834.88 with a total of \$3,325,575.50. The total project cost for option 4 is \$6,184,016.98 million. When asked if these figures are right on, Mr. White stated the hope is that they don't grow much, they have built in contingency and they didn't use so dollars per square foot. This amount does not include their fees so option 4 is based on cost estimates and based on their contract in place. There would be a request for some additional design work fees and some additional costs for material testing during construction phase. The 6.8 million dollar estimate would be closer to 7 million.

Mr. Bensyl asked what the availability is of artisans capable of doing this work. Mr. White stated it is not real pliable, they do have that concern and there is great opportunity to have stone carved, pre-cast they can do pretty well.

Mr. Beckett asked if there is no tower reconstruction what so ever, if the number for the project is \$2.58 or if there would be an additional \$900,000 for refurbishing the tower. He also stated another option would be to do nothing which would be about 4 million plus. Mr. White stated there would be the additional \$900,000.

Mr. Hannon stated the Clock & Bell Tower Citizens committee has raised about \$850,000 for the extension and have good prospects for another \$400,000. They took option four for the reasons shown to the committee and it preserved the work space. They want to do a full restoration.

Ms. Busey stated this project would be financed with funding from the public safety sales tax fund and she passed out a spreadsheet showing what the fund looks like including paying for a bond issue for this 6 million dollars which is being presented to the Finance committee this week. The spreadsheet shows the payment for the exterior project starts in 2008 for 20 years. The next available time to issue additional debt would be in 2014 but without this project the next time would be 2012 at the earliest.

Mr. White stated in rough terms they intend to bid by the end of this year with construction beginning when the weather permits next year and completion in July of 2009.

#### **Approval of Clock & Bell Tower Committee recommendation for option four for the Clock & Bell Tower Restoration**

**MOTION** by Betz to approve option 4 for the Clock & Bell Tower restoration; seconded by Richards.

Mr. Betz stated they need to restore it in such a way that we don't have to do it again; this option achieves what we are after.

Mr. James asked what happens if the Citizens Committee does not raise the funds. Mr. Hannon stated they anticipate being very close to the \$1.3 million, he believes they could get within \$100,000 of it. Mr. Beckett stated if that money isn't totally raised, we will absorb the remaining cost.

Mr. Jay stated he cannot support this because it is beyond what it began as. He stated we keep building buildings but we don't have a long term plan to take care of those buildings. If something happens and we need the public safety money, it will be gone.

Mr. James stated he has talked to Mr. White and the plan is to maintain this building, if we keep waiting to fix this building it is just going to cost more. Mr. Betz stated this is a real living building and they told the taxpayers we were going to have that tower. This is not an unexpected use for the public safety sales tax fund and he is comfortable using that money to live up to that promise.

Mr. Beckett stated every time there is an option, what has to be done to the tower changes so the County's responsibility is the tower, as it exists, and below.

**Motion carried** with a 6/2 roll call vote. Voting yes were Beckett, Betz, Cowart, James, Richards and Weibel. Voting no was Bensyl and Jay. Absent – Sapp.

#### **Approval of the entire Courthouse Masonry Exterior Stabilization & Restoration Project**

**MOTION** by Betz to approve the entire Courthouse Masonry Exterior Stabilization and Restoration Project; seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried** with a 6/2 roll call vote. Voting yes were Beckett, Betz, Cowart, James, Richards and Weibel. Voting no was Bensyl and Jay. Absent- Sapp.

Update regarding use of public safety sales tax funds

Addressed above.

#### **Champaign County Nursing Home** **Duane Morris Invoice #1312282**

**MOTION** by Weibel to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #1312282 from Duane Morris in the amount of \$517.35 for professional services rendered through May 31, 2007 in connection with general representation; seconded by Betz. **Motion carried** with Jay, Bensyl and James voting no.

#### **Request for Reduction in Retainage**

**MOTION** by Jay to recommend County Board approval of the Borchers Decorating request for reduction in retainage; seconded by Betz. **Motion carried.**

#### **PKD Pay Request #54**

Information only.

#### **Champaign County Nursing Home – Reuse** **Recommendation to approve negotiation of an amended contract with Isaksen Glerum Wachter with scope of work & fee proposal for ILEAS remodeling project**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of negotiating an amended contract with Isaksen Glerum Wachter with scope of work & fee proposal for ILEAS remodeling project; seconded by Weibel.

Mr. Page presented an update to the committee stating that they have funds in Washington but they cannot draw on them until people are working in Springfield.

They have begun the preliminary discussion with Riley, have a board from all over the state relying on him to tell them we can get this done quickly. He has worked with IGW in the past and is very comfortable with them and he feels if we went with someone else it would put the project off many months. When asked about the federal government stating they are going to release more money into this system, Mr. Page stated they passed a five year funding so he knows it will be stable for that length of time.

Mr. Bensyl voiced his support for this project and stated he feels they would be throwing good money away if they go with another firm. He asked if we are going to amend a contract or actually create a new one.

Ms. McGrath stated this was a recommendation that was discussed at the County Board in July and the statute allows us to enter into a contract with IGW because we have an existing relationship with them. We will be negotiating a new contract to do this work.

Mr. Beckett stated he suggests the word amended be stricken from the motion.

The motioner and seconder agreed to remove the word amended from the motion.

**Motion carried with Jay opposed.**

#### **Appointment of negotiating committee for A/E services**

Mr. Beckett stated this is the committee to negotiate the contract with IGW for ILEAS. His hope is that a contract can be negotiated before August 23<sup>rd</sup> and they can have a short committee meeting before the board meeting.

Mr. Richards, Ms. Cowart and Mr. James were selected to serve on the negotiating committee with Ms. Busey.

**MOTION** by Weibel to appoint Cowart, James and Richards to the negotiating committee for a/e services; seconded by Betz. **Motion carried.**

#### **Fleet Maintenance/Highway Facility** **BLDD Invoice #129349**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of invoice #129349 from BLDD in the amount of \$6,300.00 for professional architectural/engineering services rendered for the period June 2, 2007 to July 1, 2007; seconded by Cowart. **Motion carried.**

### BLDD invoice #129369

MOTION by Betz to recommend County Board approval of invoice #129369 from BLDD in the amount of \$1,903.00 for professional services rendered for the period June 2, 2007 to July 1, 2007, invoice is for facility site observation; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried.**

### Physical Plant Monthly Reports

Mr. Reinhart stated, regarding the heat issue in the County Clerk's office, he doesn't have any concerns right now. There had been work done on part of the building and it should be fine tomorrow. Concerning the hot water issue, he explained there is warm water in the bathrooms at Brookens and it is really a piping issue, only one water line runs to the bathrooms. Mr. Beckett asked Mr. Reinhart to look into the complaint of a substance on the air conditioning vents in the Clerk's office.

### Chair's Report/Issues Brookens Remodel Update

Mr. Reinhart stated the Supervisor of Assessments is occupying their new space and they will finish this week with furniture and any other outstanding items. Planning & Zoning should move next week and they will immediately start working on the entry area for RPC for the modifications needed. Mr. Dimit stated he would like the RPC remodel done before he retires, but he is not sure if that is practical and the current goal is to have the new entrance area constructed by September 1. Regarding the County Clerk space, in the handicapped voting area, he has had requests for handicapped voting booths so he sent the plans to Mr. Sheldon but has not heard anything back from him. The plan is that once they finish RPC they will go back and do the meeting room 2 extension and Mr. Sheldon's further expansion.

Mr. Beckett asked if the County Clerk expansion will be done by December 22<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. Inman stated we will make that deadline, Mr. Reinhart will keep some people on staff who have worked on a temporary basis for us and we will also start pulling in the minority firms.

Mr. Beckett stated the County Clerk commented to him about the status of the pre-qualified vendor program adopted last term. All of the minority participation projects were taken from this committee to Policy, and no one has asked him to do anything further. It is no longer within the scope of Facilities but asked the committee to let him know if they would like to do anything further. He stated he felt like no matter what the committee did it was not right, there is still a program but he has not been contacted by a single member of the public asking about it.

Mr. Inman stated he has been working with the University and by combining everyone's lists we are now up to about 50 firms. He is working with the U of I to host it on our website and they would audit it. Once we can get a contract with an A/E firm for the ILEAS project the plan is to have the minority firms be the crux of that project. Ms. Cowart asked Mr. Betz to have this item placed back on the Policy agenda.

#### **Selection of County Facilities member to sit on committee for Public art on County Property**

Mr. Beckett reminded the committee that at the last meeting he showed them proposals the committee received; if there is no objection, he would like to serve on that committee because locating those racks would be on our property and we would have to approve any decision. No committee objection to allowing Mr. Beckett to serve on the committee.

#### **County Administrator Report**

Mr. Inman updated the committee on the highway facility stating it is moving forward. They are starting to work on the North East corner on storm water which will also be good for the ILEAS project. The metal roof will be installed this week and most of the concrete floors are completed. They are starting on fiber connection between satellite jail and the building which is also important for the ILEAS project.

#### **Other Business**

##### **Supervisor of Assessments letter**

Information only

##### **CAC/CUPHD Lease Agreement**

**MOTION** by Bensyl to recommend County Board approval of the CAC/CUPHD lease agreements; seconded by Betz.

Ms. McGrath explained she worked with Mr. Grosser on this lease with input from the CAC board. Mr. Weibel stated he will abstain because he voted at the CUPHD board.

**Motion carried.**

Mr. Beckett reminded the committee there will be a short meeting at 6:30 p.m. on August 23<sup>rd</sup>, before the County Board meeting.

Consent Agenda Items

Committee consensus to include items VI B and VIII A and B on the County Board consent agenda.

Adjournment

Chair Beckett declared the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Talbott  
Administrative Secretary